Planners Stakeholders Group Meeting Notes
January 22, 2002
Maricopa Association of Governments Office
Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Andy Smith, ADOT
Nathan Crane, Avondale
Phil Garthright, Buckeye
Hank Pluster, Chandler
Paul Ferris, Eloy
Ron Short, Glendale

Wahid Alam, Mesa
Kevin Kugler, Goodyear
James Carpentier, Salt River Pima-
Maricopa Indian Community
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Don Hadder, Scottsdale

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jack Tomasik, MAG
Rita Walton, MAG

Constance Kish, MAG

Opening Comments – Jack Tomasik

Mr. Tomasik suggested that the group address the issue of significant development projects as a whole rather than separating into two groups as originally intended. Jack explained that comments on the annual report were received from a couple of people via e-mail. He decided that this input would be adequate to enable staff to outline a more complete approach. He indicated that deciding what to do with significant development projects is a more difficult task that perhaps the entire group should discuss.

Jack stated that there are four aspects of regionally significant development projects that should be discussed today, these are: 1) Threshold Criteria – criteria which would be used to determine whether or not a development is of regional significance and warrants analysis by MAG. 2) Information for Analysis – it is necessary to determine what information should be collected and analyzed. 3) Sphere of Influence – The geographic extent or the "Sphere of Influence" should be defined for projects that are reviewed and analyzed. 4) Process – A process for transmitting information to MAG for review needs to be determined. This process should be sensitive to the timeline of the development process for member agencies.

Jack indicated that he is looking for general ideas on these topic areas and that the group need not address it at a detailed level. The detail, he explained, will come later. The process is very conceptual at this point. Jack then asked people to review the enhanced notification process as a starting point. Jack explained that this information, which was sent prior to the meeting, could be used to begin the discussion of threshold criteria. He stated that although Regional Council

1

approved the enhanced notification process in 1991, it is not being adhered to by many member agencies.

Threshold Criteria

It was suggested that the group think of the criteria as macro criteria. The following comments were offered in relation to threshold criteria and analysis.

- The analysis should be based on Regional policy.
- It would be helpful to be able to analyze the cumulative impact.
- The criteria should capture large projects such as stadiums, regional malls, etc.
- The number of jobs created by an activity should be one of the criteria.
- Existing Regional plans such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Desert Spaces Plan.
- Master Planned Communities should be analyzed.
- Public Transportation
- The criteria should capture projects like the genomics facility.
- Any airport improvement that results in increased capacity should be captured.
- Trip generation should be used as one of the criteria. The threshold could be 15,000 trips/day as used in Scottsdale or a development that adds 5% or more trips to a Road of Regional Significance.
- Any land use change from employment to residential should be analyzed because of its potential to have an impact on the jobs/housing balance.
- The number of acres should be defined by land use type.
- Landfills should be included.
- Water and wastewater treatment plants.
- The siting of power plants and power lines 210 KV and up.
- Quality of life should be addressed in some way.

Discussion

❑ Why do we need to create another process if there is already one in place that is not being followed?

Jack explained that this concept stems from the Regional Governance discussions that took place about a year ago. There is a desire to review development and analyze its impact yet there is also a reluctance to relinquish any control. The concept of analyzing regionally significant development projects is a middle ground that the Management Committee and Regional Council are able to support. The focus is on compiling information on regionally significant development projects, analyzing them and sharing information with member agencies in whatever form they choose. The intent from a regional governance perspective is to inform MAG committees when they are making decisions regarding amendments to the 208 plan to allow another treatment plant and to inform decisions regarding the TIP and which projects should get funded. MAG is very cognizant of the fact that member agencies have development processes with specific timelines that need to be met.

❑ When we talk about a development being significant, what do we mean? Significant in relation to what? If the "what" is a transportation plan, then use it but we owe it as planners to look at the bigger picture including land use, and quality of life. We should be developing a vision for the region, then a plan and then develop criteria in relation to that.

❑ There should be a basline set of criteria and then 4-6 components of a project should be analyzed.

Information for Analysis

The following list includes suggestions for the type of information that should be analyzed.

- Regional transportation
- Regional open space
- Air quality
- Economic information
- Fiscal impact analysis
- schools

Discussion

❑ How would rezonings be handled? Also there may be projects that meet the criteria for review but are already entitled. When considering criteria for review of commercial projects things like big box retail should be excluded from the analysis.

❑ The discussion sounds very familiar. It seems that the same thing was done in 1991 with many of the same issues remaining. Is the executive committee aware of the enhanced notification process?

Jack explained that they are not.

❑ If they are not aware of it then maybe the process needs to be updated and people need to be educated about it. Some suggestions for updating the process include: using electronic means to notify, collecting a list of appropriate contact people, preparing a form for agencies to provide the appropriate information in a timely, simple manner.

Following the meeting, a proposal about both regionally significant development projects and MAG's enhanced notification procedure was submitted via e-mail. This concept is to create a hierarchy of land use categories and to transmit information electronically.

Classify Proposals / Projects Into Three Categories

1) Regional (Macro)
2) Semi-Regional (Micro)
3) Local (Category Reference ?)

Under the Regional or Macro Category would be those categories as defined by growing smarter legislation. Examples could also be provided to demonstrate those Macro items such as a Landfill, Waste Water Treatment Plants and their like. Additional these categories could take the default standard required by state or federal notification requirements such as 3-miles for a Landfill and etc...

1) Land Use
2) Transportation
3) Environmental / Effects
4) Economic Development
5) Growth Areas
6) Open Space
7) Water Resources
8) Cost of Development / Infrastructure

Under the Semi-Regional or Micro Category would be general consensus issues that fit a criteria such as those found in general plan dialogue for amendments. Simply have 20 to 25 categories that represent the majority of those Maricopa County jurisdictions such as...

1) Aggregate land use changes of 320 acres combined or more.
2) Residential change in land use of 160 acres of more.
3) 50% or more increase of residential density, greater than 80 acres
4) A specific plan change.
5) etc......

Under the Local Category would be changes that would be evaluated by those SIC or Standard Industry Code categories that would be grouped into those appropriate categories of the growing smarter legislation.

1) Manufacturing
      1a...sector
            1aa...specialization
                 1aaa...etc...
2) Services
3) etc....

Lastly, you would need to have a well documented and streamlined process to not delay or lengthen application processes and input. Since this is a communications model the Local Category model would apply primarily to those jurisdictions that lie adjacent or in close proximity to other jurisdictions and not involve MAG. An arbitrary distance besides, adjacency, could be given such as a half mile, or whatever works. The Regional (Macro) and Semi-Regional (Micro) Categories would involve MAG by your agency receiving

a formal submittal package with a cover report that is a standard two or three sheet boiler plate document with original materials. MAG would then provide notice and a copy of this summary of the project to those jurisdictions within the model designation and expect to receive back another boiler plate document from the notified jurisdictions within 7 to 10 days. During that time, MAG would be reviewing the project and receive replies by those notified jurisdictions in a standard MAG report and copy those jurisdiction comments to send to the project holding jurisdiction.
All this forwarding of standard documents would occur by way of e-mail and attachments to further eliminate delays and speed the process. Any comments received after a two week period from submission would be rejected as not having been received in time.

Additionally, the above ideas do not have classifications for residential, open space or institutional type land use categories, so perhaps those could tie into a 10th or 11th (whatever) category with the SIC, or...

10) Residential
      10a...Single Family
            10aa...Multiple Family
                  10aaa...Group Quarters
                        10aaa...etc...

11) Open Space
      11a...Parks
            11aa...Preserves
                  11aaa...etc...